

REMARKS

Non-elected claim 3 has been previously cancelled. The claims remaining in the application are 1 and 2.

Specification

The Abstract of the Disclosure has been amended. No new matter has been added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicant's admission as prior art in view of Ito et al. (U.S. 6,378,983) and Barry et al. (U.S. 5,309,246). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicant's admission as prior art in view of Ito et al. (U.S. 6,378,983) and Barry et al. (U.S. 5,309,246), and further in view of Dohnomae (U.S. 6,072,588). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ito et al. is significantly different from the claims of the present patent application. Referring to Figure 2 and the specifications of Ito et al., it is seen that the RIP file in Figure 2 provides a TIFF bitmap to the "compensating the difference of color reproduction regions" block. In the present invention this would comprise a file size of approximately 1.68 gigabytes. In the Ito et al. reference the "compensating" block is processing software comprising Adobe Photoshop. See column 11, line 1. The Adobe Photoshop software would be unable to handle a TIFF file this large.

Although the processing steps in Ito et al. are not specifically disclosed, it is probable that the software works as discussed in this paragraph. If the software disclosed in Ito et al. could handle a file this size, the processing steps in that software would lose all bitmap information in the processing steps. For example, separate halftone bitmaps for each color plane must be converted to a grayscale image. The separate CMYK grayscale images are combined to create a CMYK image. Each color at this stage is at one level, in other words either on or off. The image would then be resized to less pixels and less lines. The resized image has multiple levels per color, but all the bitmap information at the higher

resolution is either lost or destroyed. All of the above steps are required to apply a profile using Adobe Photoshop. See column 11, lines 12-28 of Ito et al.

The present patent application is also significantly different from Dohnomae, either by itself or in combination with Ito et al. Referring to Figures 1 and 20 of Dohnomae it is seen that data to create the proof CPb, originates after step S2, which is before creation of bitmap data bj created in step S5, "compare threshold with data." Referring to Figure 27, there is no binary bitmap data or screening step to create color proof CPa. Thus, it is seen that Dohnomae does not use one binary bitmap to create both the color proof and the printed color document.

In the Barry et al. reference, a dot gain compensation is applied in the rip prior to the screening or thresholding operation that creates the binary bitmap data. See column 4, lines 40-45; column 8, lines 20-25, lines 30-34.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, none of the prior art cited by the Office Action discloses the limitations of the claims of the present invention, either individually or in combination. Therefore, it is believed that the claims are allowable.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that additional modifications to the claims are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed below for a telephone interview and Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 29,134

Nelson A. Blish/tmp
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2720
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.